

**RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS
GAS SERVICES DIVISION**

**GAS UTILITIES
INFORMATION BULLETIN**

No. 752



**RAILROAD COMMISSION
OF TEXAS**

**Victor G. Carrillo, Chairman
Charles R. Matthews, Commissioner
Michael L. Williams, Commissioner**

**Stephen L. Pitner
Director
Gas Services Division**

July 25, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
SECTION 1 - NEW APPEALS AND APPLICATIONS FILED	2
SECTION 2 - APPEALS AND APPLICATIONS SET FOR HEARING	2
SECTION 3 - STATUS OF PENDING CASES.....	2
SECTION 4 - NOTICES OF DISMISSAL	2
SECTION 5 - ORDERS OF THE COMMISSION	3 - 11
SECTION 6 - MISCELLANEOUS	12 - 14

Orders were issued in the following dockets:

GAS UTILITIES DOCKET NO. 9465 APPEAL OF TEXAS GAS SERVICE COMPANY FROM THE ACTION FROM THE CITIES OF PORT NECHES, NEDERLAND, GROVES.

GAS UTILITIES DOCKET NO. 9369 STATEMENT OF INTENT FILED BY CENTERPOINT ENERGY ENTEx TO CHANGE RATES IN THE ENVIRONS OF THE CITY OF HOUSTON.

SECTION 1
NEW APPEALS AND APPLICATIONS FILED

DOCKET NO.	--	9524
CAPTION	--	ETC Katy Pipeline, Ltd.'s Application Pursuant to Section 311 of the Natural Gas Policy Act for Review of the Reasonableness of a Rate Being Charged Under an Existing Gas Sales Contract.
DATE FILED	--	July 15, 2004
FILED BY	--	Daniel R. Renner
EXAMINER	--	Robby Abarca
DOCKET NO.	--	9525
CAPTION	--	Application of Wise-Fuels Pipeline, Inc. for Review of the Acquisition of Tractebel Fuels, Inc.
DATE FILED	--	July 23, 2004
FILED BY	--	W. Colin Harper
EXAMINER	--	Robby Abarca

SECTION 2
APPEALS AND APPLICATIONS SET FOR HEARING OR PREHEARING CONFERENCE

None at this time.

SECTION 3
STATUS OF PENDING CASES

None at this time.

SECTION 4
NOTICES OF DISMISSAL

None at this time.

SECTION 5
ORDERS OF THE COMMISSION

BEFORE THE
RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

APPEAL OF TEXAS GAS SERVICE COMPANY FROM THE ACTION FROM THE CITIES OF PORT NECHES, NEDERLAND, GROVES	§ § § §	GAS UTILITIES DOCKET NO. 9465
--	----------------------------	--

FINAL ORDER

Notice of Open Meeting to consider this Order was duly posted with the Secretary of State within the time period provided by law pursuant to TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. Chapter 551, et seq. (Vernon 1994 & Supp. 2004). The Railroad Commission of Texas adopts the following findings of fact and conclusions of law and orders as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Texas Gas Service Company ("TGS") is a gas utility that owns and operates a natural gas distribution system serving the Cities of Groves, Nederland, Port Arthur, and Port Neches, Texas, which is also known as the South Jefferson County Service Area ("SJCSA").
2. On November 15, 2002, TGS's predecessor in interest, Southern Union Gas Company ("SUGC") filed a Statement of Intent to increase rates within the Cities of Groves, Nederland, Port Arthur, and Port Neches.
3. In March of 2003, TGS settled with the City of Port Arthur and began charging its proposed rates within the City of Port Arthur.
4. SUGC published notice of the proposed increase for four consecutive weeks beginning on November 30, 2002.
5. The proposed notice indicated that SUGC proposed to increase base rate by \$518,950 plus revenue-related taxes.
6. The Statement of Intent and the Notice indicated that SUGC proposed to collect revenue-related taxes as a surcharge.
7. The overall increase proposed in the Statement of Intent was \$853,761.
8. In the Statement of Intent SUGC proposed a revenue requirement of \$6,466,468.
9. SUGC transferred its assets to ONEOK in the South Jefferson County Service Area in January of 2003.
10. ONEOK is a public corporation with its headquarters in Tulsa, Oklahoma.
11. TGS is a division of ONEOK, and TGS took over the operations of the SJCSA.
12. TGS continued to negotiate with the remaining cities: Groves, Nederland, and Port Neches ("Cities")
13. The original Statement of Intent employed a test year ending March 31, 2002.

14. The original Statement of Intent did not take into consideration the sale of SUGC's assets to ONEOK.
15. TGS and the Cities signed a mediation agreement on April 11, 2003.
16. Pursuant to the terms of the mediation agreement TGS was to update its original Statement of Intent.
17. Pursuant to the terms of the mediation agreement TGS was allowed to implement its rates within the cities of Port Neches, Nederland, and Grove under a bond.
18. On June 27, 2003, TGS filed an update based upon a test year ending December 31, 2002.
19. The June 27, 2003, update filed by TGS indicated that the utility could justify an increase in rates of \$692,728, plus revenue related taxes.
20. TGS proposed to collect revenue-related taxes as a surcharge.
21. The overall increase indicated by TGS in its June 27, 2003, update was \$1,013,007.
22. TGS did not amend the notice that was issued in November of 2003.
23. TGS asserted that it was not seeking a revenue increase of \$692,728, plus revenue related taxes, totaling of \$1,013,007. Instead, TGS asserted that it sought \$518,950, plus revenue related taxes, totaling \$853,761.
24. After the update was filed, the Cities could not approve a rate increase greater than the rate increase noticed and proposed in the original Statement of Intent.
25. The City of Port Neches denied the proposed increase on October 16, 2003; the City of Groves denied the proposed increase on October 21, 2003; the City of Nederland denied the proposed increase on October 13, 2003.

Petition for Review

26. TGS timely filed its *Petition for Review* on November 12, 2003.
27. The *Petition for Review* was based upon a test year ending December 31, 2002, adjusted for known and measurable changes through September 30, 2003.
28. The hearing on the rates was conducted on April 13, 14, 15, 2004, and on May 4, 2004.

Allocation of Common Costs

29. TGS incurs various costs from many divisions that perform services for TGS.
30. TGS uses a Joint and Common Costs allocator to allocate costs from ONEOK, the parent company of TGS, to its various divisions.
31. The Joint and Common Costs allocator proposed by TGS is a three step process.
32. First, costs specifically attributed to TGS are directly charged to TGS.
33. Second, indirect costs that are significant in amount but cannot be directly charged are allocated to business units using allocation factors that distribute the cost in a manner consistent with the functions that caused those costs.
34. Third, any remaining costs that cannot be associated with a specific, identifiable causal relationship are pooled as corporate overhead and allocated among the business entities using a three-factor formula comprised of gross plant

and investment, operating income, and labor expenses.

- 35. The Joint and Common Costs allocator proposed by TGS is reasonable.
- 36. TGS proposed allocating costs among the Texas Regions and Services Areas of TGS based on the single factor of the number of customers.
- 37. TGS's proposed methods of allocating costs among the Texas Regions and Services Areas of TGS are reasonable.

Rate Base

- 38. TGS's invested capital rate base, adjusted for investments and deductions is \$16,210,137.
- 39. Total Plant in Service is \$17,287,671.
- 40. Cash Working Capital in the amount of \$277,492 was determined by a lead-lag study.
- 41. Materials and Supplies is \$96,388.
- 42. Prepayments are \$40,972.
- 43. TGS's invested capital was reduced for customer deposits of \$472,127; customer advances of \$62,029; contribution in aid of construction of \$347,443; and accumulated deferred income tax of \$55,803.

Rate of Return

- 44. A capital structure for TGS comprised of 53.5% common equity and 46.5% long-term debt is reasonable.
- 45. Using ONEOK's 6.25% embedded cost of debt is reasonable for determining an appropriate rate of return for TGS.
- 46. A cost of long-term debt for TGS of 6.25% is reasonable.
- 47. A cost of common equity of 10.30% is reasonable.
- 48. An overall rate of return of 8.42% is reasonable.

Revenues and Expenses

- 49. TGS's calculation of test-year revenues excludes revenues from gross receipts and franchise taxes should be removed.
- 50. TGS removed revenues from gross receipts and franchise taxes from calculated expenses.
- 51. Removing gross receipts and franchise taxes from TGS's calculation of test year expenses and test year revenues is reasonable.
- 52. Weather has an impact on the sale of gas, which in turn affects revenues as well as income.
- 53. In determining a utility's test year revenues and expenses it is reasonable to use weather normalized rates.
- 54. A weather normalization based on 10 years of weather data best reflects ongoing conditions regarding the SJCSA.
- 55. A weather normalization based on 10 years of weather data is consistent with prior orders of the Commission.
- 56. TGS's test year revenues should reflect a decrease of \$122,768 for weather normalization.

57. In determining a utility's test year revenues and expenses it is appropriate to normalize changes in customer growth.
58. TGS's calculation of customer growth adjustment has varied from \$20,376, to \$68,020.
59. A customer growth adjustment based upon average customers is reasonable.
60. TGS's test year revenues should reflect a normalized customer growth adjustment of \$9,659, which represents a decrease of 442 residential bills and 124 commercial bills.
61. TGS proposed a load attrition adjustment, a reduction of \$75,065, in test-year revenues to reflect anticipated declines in gas usage by its residential customers due to such factors as improved appliance efficiency and customer conservation.
62. An adjustment to the test-year period based on speculative claims regarding residential customers' future usage patterns are not justified.
63. The Cities proposed to add the Port Arthur revenue increase to the calculation of test-year revenues, thereby reducing the estimated revenue deficiency.
64. TGS calculated its revenue requirement based upon the entire SJCSA and the rates set in this case will only apply to the Cities of Port Neches, Nederland, and Groves.
65. Adjusting revenues by adding the revenues from Port Arthur will result in an under recovery by TGS and is not reasonable.
66. Depreciation and Amortization expenses in the amount of \$724,261 are reasonable.
67. Taxes other than income taxes, excluding revenue-related taxes, in the amount of \$470,959 are reasonable.
68. Interest on customer deposits in the amount of \$28,328 are reasonable.
69. Distribution & Maintenance expenses in the amount of \$1,359,520 are reasonable.
70. Customer Accounts Expenses in the amount of \$680,863 are reasonable.

Rate Design

71. TGS's proposal to consolidate several classes and eliminate corresponding tariffs is reasonable and simplifies TGS's rate structure.
72. Residential rates comprised of a customer charge of \$10.00 and a volumetric rate of \$.1099 is just and reasonable.
73. Commercial Sales rates composed of a customer charge of \$14.50, Commercial Transportation customer charge of \$287.23, volumetric rates of \$0.0992 for the first 250 Ccf, and \$0.0716 for all CcF over 250 Ccf is just and reasonable.
74. Public authority and school rates composed of a customer charge of \$13.00, a volumetric charge of \$.1286 for the first 250 Ccf, and \$0.1028 for all CcF over 250 Ccf is just and reasonable.
75. Industrial transportation rates composed of a customer charge \$287.23, a volumetric charge of \$.1146 for the first 400 Ccf, and \$0.0856 for all CcF over 400 Ccf is just and reasonable.
76. TGS proposed a provision entitled "Prompt Payment Provision" on residential, commercial, and public authority

tariffs.

77. Pursuant to the prompt payment provision after 15 days following rendering of the bill, an additional (5%) percent penalty will be added if the bill has not been paid.
78. The Quality of Service Rules of the Railroad Commission do not allow the imposition of a penalty and the proposed provision cannot be included in tariffs.
79. TGS proposed a provision in its Gas Cost Adjustment Clause that referred to “the known volumes of gas that may be otherwise accounted for” and the phrase “and accidental discharges of gas from the company’s system during the same period.”
80. Section 7.5525 of the Railroad Commission rules, referring to Lost and Unaccounted for Gas, does not allow for known volumes to be included in Lost and Unaccounted for Gas.
81. TGS proposed a Weather Normalization Clause.
82. The Weather Normalization Clause normalizes volumes and revenues for variable weather and is reasonable.

Rate Case Expenses

83. The requested rate case expenses of the Cities in the amount of \$285,884.99 are reasonable. Those expenses include the following:
 - a. Cities’ requested actual rate case expenses of \$193,084.99 for actual work performed.
 - b. Cities’ estimated future rate case expenses of \$92,800.
84. TGS requested rate case expenses in the amount of \$812,324.47.
85. TGS’s rate case expenses associated with the initial Statement of Intent and Notice were \$54,943.33.
86. The Cities’ rate case expenses associated with the initial Statement of Intent and Notice were \$38,225.10.
87. TGS was required to update its original Statement of Intent because of the merger between ONEOK and SUGC that was consummated approximately two months after the filing of its original Statement of Intent.
88. TGS was required to update its original Statement of Intent in order to clarify its treatment of revenue-related taxes because the total amount of revenue-related taxes could not be ascertained from the original filing.
89. TGS’s requested rate-case expenses for witness training by M.J. Berns were \$11,890.
90. TGS did not establish that witness training by M.J. Berns was reasonable and necessary in this case.
91. TGS requested rate-case expenses for consulting services provided by Dively and Associates in the amount of \$80,480.
92. ively and Associated was retained to ascertain the effects of merger between ONEOK and SUGC.
93. Merger related costs associated with the work performed by Dively and Associates should not be included as a rate-case expenses.
94. TGS’s the rate case expenses associated with the initial filing are not reasonable and necessary.
95. The Cities’ reasonable and necessary rate case expenses associated with the initial filing should paid by TGS and not

the ratepayers.

96. The rate case expenses of Dively and Associates and M.J. Berns are not reasonable.
97. The rate case expenses of TGS in the amount of \$665,010.75 are reasonable. Those expenses include the following:
 - a. TGS' actual rate case expenses of \$530,690.75 for actual work performed.
 - b. TGS' estimated future rate case expenses of \$134,320.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. TGS is a gas utility as defined in Texas Utilities Code (TUC). TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. §§ 101.003(7) and 121.001 (Vernon Supp. 2004).
2. TGS's filing of its *Petition for Review* complied with the requirements of TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 103.054 (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).
3. The overall revenue requirement established in this Order will permit TGS a reasonable opportunity to earn a reasonable return on its invested capital used and useful in providing service to the public in excess of its reasonable and necessary operating expenses under TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 104.051 (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).
4. An appeal under the TUC is *de novo* and based on the test year presented to the municipality adjusted for known changes and conditions that are measurable with reasonable accuracy. TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 103.055(a) (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).
5. On appeal the Railroad Commission shall enter a final order establishing the rates the Railroad Commission determines the municipality should have set in the ordinance to which the appeal applies. TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 103.055(b) (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).
6. TGS failed to meet its burden of proof on the elements of its requested rate increase identified in this order TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 104.008 (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).
7. The rates established in this Order will not yield more than a fair return on the adjusted value of the invested capital used and useful in providing service to the public, under TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 104.052 (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).
8. The rates and rate design reflected in the findings of fact are just and reasonable, not unreasonably preferential, prejudicial, or discriminatory, but are sufficient, equitable, and consistent in application to each class of customer, under TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 104.003 (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).
9. Each party seeking reimbursement for its rate case expenses has the burden to prove the reasonableness of such rate case expenses by a preponderance of the evidence, under 16 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 7.57 (West 2004).
10. The Quality of Service Rules of the Commission do not allow a utility to impose a penalty. 16 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 7.465 (West 2004).

11. The Section 7.5525 of the Railroad Commission rules, referring to Lost and Unaccounted for Gas, does not allow for known volumes to be included in Lost and Unaccounted for Gas. TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 7.5519 (West 2004).
12. The rate case expenses enumerated in the finding of fact herein are reasonable and comply with 16 TEX. ADMIN. CODE ANN. § 7.57 (West 2000).
13. The Commission has the authority to allow TGS to recover rate case expenses through a surcharge on its rates, under TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 104.051 (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).
14. It is reasonable for the Commission to order TGS to pay the Cities' incurred rate case expenses, and estimated rate case expenses. TEX. UTIL. CODE ANN. § 103.022 (Vernon 1998 & Supp. 2004).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that TGS' requested rates are **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the rates and rate design reflected in the findings of fact, in the Schedules attached and conclusions of law are **APPROVED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that TGS shall file tariffs incorporating rates consistent with this Order within thirty days of the date of this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that TGS is authorized to recover a surcharge on its rates charged to ratepayers in the Cities of Groves, Nederland and Port Neches calculated on Ccf basis over a period of sixty (60) months, commencing with the date rates set in this docket become effective. As estimated expenses are actually incurred, TGS is authorized to add to the amount subject to surcharge up to the total of estimated expenses for TGS and the Cities of Groves, Nederland and Port Neches contained in this order. **IT IS ALSO ORDERED** that TGS may not recover from rate-payers rate case expenses incurred by the Cities of Groves, Nederland and Port Neches in the amount of \$38,225.10. **IT IS ALSO ORDERED** that TGS shall file a quarterly report informing the Railroad Commission of the balance of the surcharge with the Director of the Gas Services Division.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that TGS shall reimburse the Cities of Groves, Nederland and Port Neches their incurred rate case expenses approved herein, and estimated rate case expenses up to the amount authorized herein.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that TGS **SHALL** include in its purchase gas adjustment only its reasonable and necessary gas purchase expenditures and that the reasonableness and prudence of TGS' gas purchases pursuant to its Cost of Gas clause may be subject to an adjustment and potential refund in a subsequent proceeding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that TGS shall calculate the amount of refunds and interest due pursuant to this Order resulting from bonded rates ordered by the Cities of Port Neches, Nederland and Groves, effective April of 2003. Interest shall be calculated in accordance bond provision, if any, and the rules of the Railroad Commission from the date the excess collections were received until the date payment is finally made, which shall be no later than sixty days from the date of this Order. Interest shall be compounded monthly. Within thirty days of the date of this Order, TGS shall file a schedule and workpapers with the Commission Audit Staff and the Cities detailing the calculation of refunds and interest.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law not specifically adopted herein are **DENIED**. **IT IS ALSO ORDERED** that each exception to the Examiners' Proposal for Decision not expressly granted herein is overruled and all pending motions and requests for relief not previously granted herein are hereby **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 22nd day of July, 2004.

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

/s/
VICTOR CARRILLO
CHAIRMAN

/s/
CHARLES R. MATTHEWS
COMMISSIONER

/s/
MICHAEL L. WILLIAMS
COMMISSIONER

ATTEST

/s/ Kim Williamson
SECRETARY

**BEFORE THE
RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS**

STATEMENT OF INTENT FILED BY CENTERPOINT ENERGY ENTEX TO CHANGE RATES IN THE ENVIRONS OF THE CITY OF HOUSTON, TEXAS	§ § § §	GAS UTILITIES DOCKET NO. 9469
--	----------------------------	--

ORDER

Notice of Open Meeting to consider this Order was duly posted with the Secretary of State within the time period provided by law pursuant to TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. Chapter 551 *et seq.* (Vernon 1994 & Supp. 2004).

The Commission signed a final order in this docket on June 8, 2004. The Order was mailed to all parties on June 9, 2004, and was presumed received on June 12, 2004.

CenterPoint Energy Entex ("Entex") timely filed a Motion for Rehearing. The Commission finds that the Motion for Rehearing does not raise any new issues of fact or law that require rehearing.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED BY THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS that Entex's Motion for Rehearing is **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 22nd day of July, 2004.

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

/s/
CHAIRMAN VICTOR CARRILLO

/s/
COMMISSIONER CHARLES R. MATTHEWS

/s/
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL L. WILLIAMS

ATTEST

/s/ Kim Williamson

SECRETARY**SECTION 6
MISCELLANEOUS****STEPHEN L. PITNER, GAS SERVICES DIVISION DIRECTOR****1. OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR****A. Publications**

1. Texas Utilities Code Titles 3 and 4. Special Rules of Practice and Procedure and Substantive Rules - \$15.00
2.
 - a. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2002 – Now available via the Commission’s website at:
<http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/divisions/gs/tablecontents02.html>
 - b. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2001 – available via the Commission’s website at:
<http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/divisions/gs/tablecontents01.html>
 - a. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2000 - \$17.00 (includes statistical data for 1999)
 - b. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1999 - \$9.00 (includes statistical data for 1998)
 - c. Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1998 - \$7.00 (includes statistical data for 1997)
3. Six MCF Monthly Residential Gas Bill Analysis for Twenty-five Texas Cities - \$2.00 – Now available via the Commission’s website at: <http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/divisions/gs/rap/sixmcf.html>

Anyone who wishes to obtain a copy of any of the publications or maps listed in Section A should contact the Central Records Section at 512-463-6887 OR 512-463-6882 P. O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78711-2967.

B. Interest Rate on Customer Deposits

We have been advised by the Public Utility Commission that the interest rate to be applied to customer deposits in calendar year 2004 is 6.00%. All gas utilities should use this rate.

2. UTILITY AUDIT SECTION**A. Maintains headquarters and three district offices as follows:**

Headquarters - William B. Travis Building

1701 North Congress, P. O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78701

Ed Abrahamson, Director

Telephone (512) 463-7022

Dallas District- 1546 Rowlett Rd., Suite 107, Garland, Texas 75043

Telephone (972) 240-5757;
Fax (972)303-1897

Yolandra Davis, Auditor

Josh Settle, Auditor

Austin District- P. O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78711-2967

Telephone (512) 463-7022

Stephen Cooper, Senior Auditor

Houston District- 1706 Seamist Drive. Suite 501, Houston, Texas 77008-3135 Telephone (713) 869-8425;
Fax (713)869-3219

Larry Alcorn, Auditor
Dale Francis, Auditor
Brian L. Sparkman, Auditor
Margie Stoney, Senior Auditor
Konata Uzoma, Auditor

B. Gas Utility Tax, Annual Reports and Audit Reports

Questions relating to gas utility tax, annual reports and audit reports, call Shannon L. Miller at (512) 463-7022.

C. Available Information

Copies of company annual reports (1994 to present), as well as information relating to any of the above, A through C, are available for review at the William B. Travis Building, Gas Services Division, 9th Floor, 1701 North Congress. All requests for copies must be made in writing and should be addressed to the Audit Section. Copies will be provided for a fee, depending on the volume of copy work desired, allow a minimum of five days for completion of requests. Inquiries regarding copies should be directed to the Audit Section at (512) 463-7022, or Fax your request to (512) 475-3180.

3. MARKET OVERSIGHT

A. Maintains the following office to assist you:

Headquarters - William B. Travis Building
1701 North Congress, P.O. Box 12967, Austin, Texas 78711 Telephone (512) 463-7164
William O. Geise, Director

B. Gas Utilities Information Bulletin

Published on the Commission's web site at: <http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/divisions/gs/rap/rapbls.html>.

C. Proposals For Decision

Published on the Commission's web site at: <http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/divisions/gs/rap/pfds.html>.

D. Tariff Filings

Questions pertaining to the filing of tariffs and/or quality of service rules should be directed to Kathy Arroyo, Yolanda Lovelace or Marie Blanco at (512) 463-7164.

E. Curtailments

Curtailment questions should be referred to (512) 463-7164. Curtailment reports made Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., should be made to (512) 463-7164. Curtailment reports made during hours other than those specified above and holidays, should be made to (512) 463-6788.

F. Compliance Filings

Questions regarding gas utilities docket compliance filing requirements should be referred to Mark Brock at (512) 463-7164.

G. Complaints and Inquiries

All complaints and inquiries relating to the gas utility industry should be directed to the Market Oversight Section at (512) 463-7164.

H. Pending RRC Rules and Regulations:

GUD No. 9253 New Rule for Relocation Cost Recovery Factor

GUD No. 9275 Amendments to §7.512 NGPA Section 311 Rate Review

GUD No. 9276 Amendments to §7.511 TUC Section 102.054 Sale, Transfer, Merger Reviews

GUD No. 9277 Amendments to §7.305 Curtailment Rule

GUD No. 9449 Amendments to §7.45 Quality of Service

4. HEARINGS AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Miscellaneous

Anyone wishing to obtain copies of appendices to Orders appearing in Section 5 of this Bulletin should contact the Legal Division at (512) 463-7017.

B. Status of Pending Cases

The status of all pending cases listed in Section 3 of this Bulletin is for informational purposes only and is complete up to the time of printing of this Bulletin. For a more accurate status of pending cases, please call the Legal Division at (512) 463-7017.